UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,509	08/27/2003	Jeffrey Hubbell	CIT 2606 CIP CON	7219
23579 PATREA L. PA	7590 05/13/200 ABST		EXAMINER	
	NT GROUP LLP		LANKFORD JR, LEON B	
1201 PEACHT	SQUARE, SUITE 1200 REE STREET	U	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, GA	A 30361		1651	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/13/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/650,509	HUBBELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leon Lankford	1651	

	Leon Lankford	1651						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f</li> </ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extraorder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>05 February 2008</u>. A bithe date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply</li> </ol>	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disn	nissal of the					
AMENDMENTS								
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a)</li></ol>	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(-	, .					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) the how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>as in final rejection</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a					
10.	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:					
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/Loop Dionistend in							
	/Leon B Lankford Jr/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1651						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the papers filed 2/5/08 & 3/28/08 have been entered and considered. The amendment filed 3/28/08 will be entered. The ODP rejections remain for the reasosn of record set forth in the final office action of 10/05/07. As noted then, common ownership is a prerequisite for obviating an ODP rejection with a TD not for making the rejection. If the instant application and a patent or application share an inventor, that is sufficient for the claims to be considered for ODP. TD should be submitted for the 744 and 422 patents. Applicant 's arguments have overcome the ODP rejection over the '022 patent because the claims of that patent do not render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant correctly identified the examiner's transposition of the numbers in appl number 10/325051, now US Pat 7247609. Applicant's arguments regarding the ODP over now patent 7247609 are not persuasive because the patent is not being applied as prior art and the legal basis of the ODP is correct despite the lack of common ownership. The Claims of 7247609 are drawn to essentially the same invention as is instantly claimed except that the claims are drawn to a species of peptide growth factor, PTH, rather than the genus which the species anticipates. The rejection over copending application 10/323046 are similarly maintained for the reasosn of record.